IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC

WEDNESDAY, THE 9TH JANUARY 2008 / 19TH POUSHA 1929

WP(C).No. 33588 of 2007(W)

PETITIONERS:
----

1. **KERALA RETAIL RATION DEALERS ASSOCIATION (PDS) REG.NO.01/05/1993, NADAKKAL, ADUTHARA PO, KOLLAM 691 579, REPRESENTED BY ITS GENERAL SECRETARY,P. PUSHPANGADA KURUP.**

2. **R.SARANGADHRAN,S/O.RAGHAVAN, AGED 56 YEARS,RESIDING AT KUNJIRAMA VILASAM,KILLIKOLLOOR PO, KOLLAM DISTRICT, PROPRIETOR, ARD 156, KILLIKOLLOOR KOLLAM DISTRICT,**

BY ADV. SRI.MILLU DANDAPANI

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. **STATE OF KERALA REPRESENTED BY THE SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT FOOF & CIVIL SUPPLIES DEPARTMENT, GOVERNMENT SECRETARIAT, TRIVANDRUM-695001.**

2. **THE DIRECTOR OF CIVIL SUPPLIES TRIVANDRUM 695001.**

3. **THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY (FINANCE) FINANCE (NON TAX REVENUE CELL) DEPARTMENT, TRIVANDRUM-695001.**

BY GOVT.PLEADER SRI.I.V.PRAMOD

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 09/01/2008,THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

ANTONY DOMINIC, J.
==========
W.P.(C) NO. 33588 OF 2007 W
==========

Dated this the 9th day of January, 2008

J U D G M E N T

By Ext.P1 oder dated 1/3/1999, licence fee was enhanced. Of course, this was subject matter challenged in OP 10766/1999, which was disposed of by Ext.P2 judgment. In the judgment, this court did not grant any relief, but however, directed disposal of the representation. In pursuance to the said judgment, the representations were disposed of by Ext.P3 order dated 19/10/2005. Petitioner did not challenge the said order. Long thereafter, Ext.P4 representation was made on 14/8/07 and now this writ petition is filed praying for quashing Ext.P3 and for other consequential reliefs.

2. In my view, this writ petition is highly belated. If the petitioner was aggrieved by Ext.P3 order, he should have approached this court within a reasonable time thereafter. This has not been done. It is only in order to get over delay involved that a representation has been made in this distance of time and

writ petition is filed now. The representation Ext.P4 does not save the petitioner from the latches and delay involved. It is true that the petitioner has submitted about the pendency of writ petition raising challenge against Ext.P3. That, in my view, can be no answer to the belated challenge in this writ petition.

Writ petition fails and is dismissed.

ANTONY DOMINIC, JUDGE.

Rp